UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese } *Associate Editors*

The Trial of British Engineers in Moscow

By ANNA LOUISE STRONG

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 12

Chicago, May 22, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 183
A World Society—CURTIS W. REESE 185
Jottings—J. H. H. 187
ARTICLES—
The Trial of British Engineers in Moscow—ANNA LOUISE STRONG 187
Why Are Jews Persecuted—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 189
POETRY—
Thou Shalt Not—*R. P. Mendes* 183
Trumpets on New Horizons:
Outcasts—MARY OWEN LEWIS 194
A Factory Worker—ALICE GARDNER SPENCER 194
Eternal Windows—ELIZABETH VOSS 194
Closed Doors—JOSEPH LEISER 194
A Paean for Her—LEONORA OWSLEY HERMAN 194
THE STUDY TABLE—
The Epic of John Brown—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 193
Book Notes—CURTIS W. REESE 194
CORRESPONDENCE—
An Educational Center—WILLIAM H. BRIDGE 195
Sentences from UNITY's Correspondence:
I. ELMER WARD COLE 195
II. L. B. H. 195
III. M. G. M. 195
IV. GEORGE SCHUMM 195
V. AMBALAL D. PATEL 195
THE FIELD—
An Indian Moderate on India 182

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Indian Moderate on India

In the final discussion at the Third Session of the Round Table Conference on December 23-24, 1932, the problem of Mr. Gandhi and of the 15,000 political prisoners in India lay like a deep and foreboding shadow. "So long," said Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, "as you have Mr. Gandhi in jail, you will find that the people of India will not seriously consider constitution-making."

"I have never known in my thirty years' experience as a public man," said the Moderate Hindu leader, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, "so much bitterness, so much hostile feeling in Indian homes, as I have witnessed during the last few months."

"The state of the country is alarming," added Sir Manubhai Mehta, representative of one of the Indian States. The release of the prisoners and the opportunity of free discussion in India was pressed by others of the Indian representatives.

This problem is one of humanity; it is also one of common sense and political vision.

At Anderton's Hotel in the Strand in London on December 23rd, last, the Indian Conciliation Group held a public meeting for the purpose of enabling Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar to make an appeal to the English public on this question before they left for India. Sir Tej Sapru then, after dealing at length with the results of the Round Table Conference, went on to point out the importance of winning the support of the popular party for the new Constitution and said:

"I speak to you in the friendliest spirit. Let me tell you that the situation in India during the last twelve months has been very serious and very grave.

"I am not here to discuss the policy of the government at length, but I do desire to tell you that the amount of dissatisfaction with the Government, the amount of discontent, the amount of bitterness in India in nearly every home, has been far greater than at any time within my experience.

"I wish you to wake up to the reality of the situation. Do not treat me as an alarmist, but I want you to understand that as far as Congress is concerned, although I differ radically from Congress in regard to some measures of its work, it is still a power. It has captured the imagination. Whether it should have, or whether it should not have, is a different question. I am stating a fact, and this political sentiment, let me tell you, is not confined to the intellectual classes. It has spread into the innermost recesses of the villages.

"This is one of the modern miracles, and I would beg of you not to accept the estimates that are placed before you, which tend to say that it is only men like Mr. Jayakar or myself, the so-called Moderates, or men like Mr. Gandhi and Jawaharalal Nehru, who

(*Continued on page* 195)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, MAY 22, 1933 Number 12

THOU SHALT NOT!

[Prompted by Mussolini's statement that the world needs less politics and more honesty and morality.]

We are a war-weary world;
We are tired of greed and graft;
We live in a world where guarantees are no guaranty,
And Trusts are not to be trusted.
O for a new spirit in Education
That shall stress Idealism above nationalism,
And Right above Might;
So that Civilization shall ever go forward!
O for leaders that shall lead us aright
And place honesty above personal gain!
Lost are the meanings of "mine" and "thine."
Forgotten are the Commands:
Thou shalt not covet, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not kill.
And the gravest of these—and leading to the others,
Is: "Thou shalt not covet";
For if we do not covet,
We shall not want that which is not ours,
But our neighbor's—near or far.
Great need have we to learn the lesson:
"Do unto others as we would be done by,"
"Love thy neighbor as thyself,"
"Love the stranger" (of different race and creed);
"Hate not thy brother in thy heart."
Then would the Nations stop jumping at each other's throats,
Filled with suspicion and jealousy.
Then shall Everyman sit in peace under his own fig tree;
And "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
Nor shall they learn war any more."
Then shall we have the dawn
Of "universal peace," "universal brotherhood," "universal happiness."

—R. P. Mendes.

"The American people have been
through many worse times than these"
—Walter Lippman, in New York *Herald-Tribune.*

Name them, Mr. Lippman, name them! And not one, or two, if you please, but "many. For "many" means what it says—according to the dictionary, "numerous, a great number." If the American people in their one hundred and fifty years of national life have "been through" a great number of "worse times than these," their history must be one long record of disaster. But we have found it so described in no textbook, large or small, that we have ever read. We have no interest, however, in quibbling. If Mr. Lippman cannot name "many worse times than these," let him name two or three. Let him name even *one!* We do not pretend to have any exhaustive knowledge of American history, but we are familiar with the story as presented by Bancroft, Channing, Rhodes, Morison, Beard and Adams, and we can recall not a single period or episode which matches Lippman's assertion. To speak of the various "panics" which have dotted the years in the same breath at all with the current debâcle is either ignorance or just plain fatuousness. The black years 1837, 1857, 1873, 1893, 1903, 1923 were a dull and rather attractive gray as compared with the midnight horror of the present hour. Mr. Lippman must know this, and therefore he must be thinking of the only kind of disaster which is greater than that of an economic collapse—namely, war. Indeed, the worst collapses, as in this case, invariably follow and are caused by, wars. From this standpoint, Mr. Lippman can have had only one period in mind, the Civil War. In those dreadful years from 1861 to 1865, the life of the nation was certainly at stake. But we think none the less that, in the darkest days of the Great Rebellion, there was a confidence, as there was an excitement, which do not exist and are not justified today. No, Mr. Lippman in the statement above quoted was using loose words in behalf of optimism in time of stress which may be explicable in the case of politicians, bankers and brokers, but are unworthy of a man who at least pretends to be a scholar.

We do not want to criticize Mr. Roosevelt. We do not know enough yet of what he is actually trying to do, to criticize him. Furthermore, we think a man as energetic and courageous as the President has shown himself to be in the face of the present crisis, is entitled for a time at least to immunity from censure. But if we may not criticize, we must confess confusion. There are some things, and important things, which we cannot understand. For example, amid all the welter of contradictory opinion as to what should be done to cure the depression, one opinion has certainly been agreed upon by all the physicians. We refer to the idea that confidence must be reestablished. It was because confidence seemed to be returning after long absence with the advent of Roosevelt, that a new psychology of hope and faith seemed to be possessing this stricken nation. But now what is becoming of this confidence? If the old pre-Roosevelt temper of uncertainty and alarm,

even despair, is beginning to creep in upon our minds again, who or what is to blame but the administration? Take the inflation legislation, for example! Here is a bill which places supreme power over the currency in the hands of the President, and, by the very nature of its permissory provisions, leaves altogether uncertain what is going to happen. As a matter of fact, almost anything may happen at the discretion of the White House—which means that no man knows today what his money may be worth tomorrow. "I do not see," says the Washington correspondent of the *Nation*, "how this uncertainty can fail to have a bad effect. . . . How confidence can be restored by keeping the whole country in a state of suspense over the future value of the national currency baffles me." The same thing is true of the Farm Bill, which promises to lead the nation on a journey not unlike the immortal Theodore's trip down the "River of Doubt." What seems to us to be the net result of an exceedingly well-intentioned and in many ways wise program is confusion—and if business can recover in such an atmosphere, then we are surely learning something. It may well be true, of course, that confusion is inevitable as a first step toward the new order promised by "the new deal." If so, then let's hustle up and get it over!

How to break the vicious circle—this is the pressing question of the hour! We see the dilemma in the railroad world. For years, largely owing to the competition of automobiles, passenger traffic has been declining. To meet this emergency, the railroads have reduced the number of trains. Less patronage, less service! But now it is beginning to work disastrously the other way. As there are now so few trains, people are deserting the railroads altogether, and the passenger traffic is in many cases becoming practically nonexistent. Which draws the vicious circle—reduced patronage brings reduced service, and reduced service brings reduced patronage! We see the same phenomenon in this depression. If prosperity is ever to return, purchasing power on the part of the people must be increased. But in order to survive at all, business has had to lower wages, and thus lower the purchasing power of millions of employees. Which draws the vicious circle again—bad business producing a loss of purchasing power, and thus in turn producing bad business! Another illustration of this dilemma comes from the international field, specifically in the case of disarmament. What is the matter at Geneva, that the Conference can seem to accomplish nothing in the matter of getting rid of arms, or even of lowering the standard a little? The answer to this question is easy. The nations will not cut their armies and navies because they feel so insecure; and they feel so insecure because these mounting armaments on land and sea still remain so powerful. To reduce arms would establish security, but security must first be established before arms can be reduced. Such is the riddle that confronts us in problem after problem. Around and around the vicious circle we race, never finding the point where we can break away and thus get started on the straight line of progress. Yet the point must be found, if humanity is not to perish of its own dizziness. It is here that statesmanship of the genuine order marks itself off from mere politics. The politician is the man who knows nothing better to do than to lead his fellows around that vicious circle. The statesman is the man who finds the way out, and takes it! If Mr. Roosevelt is that man, and statesman, then is his immortality.

"There is no Jewish Problem in the U. S. S. R.," runs a headline in a recent issue of the Moscow *Daily News* (weekly edition, April 10th). On the front page is printed a beautiful picture of a "Soviet Jewess," a charming young girl peaceful and happy over her books. On an inner page is a smaller picture of a "Jewish Shock Brigadier," a sturdy young Jew, Rabinovitch by name, toiling at a machine in the Stalingrad Tractor Plant, where he has been decorated with the Order of Lenin. Against the dark background of the old Jewish "pale" in the Tsarist days, the special article in the *Daily News* sets the scene of the new revolutionary regime. The employment of Jews in industry has gone forward with giant strides; by 1931 there were 342,000 Jewish workers in the factories, and today the total exceeds half a million. Jewish boys and girls are today swarming in the apprenticeship schools side by side with Gentile comrades. Especially interesting is the settlement of Jewish colonists on the land. This work began as early as 1924, when Jewish traders and merchants in the cities, dispossessed by Communism, had fallen to the last stages of human misery. Today there are nearly a quarter of a million Jews engaged in farming on their own lands, on which stand their homes and schools. The Crimea has 29,000 Jewish settlers living in 100 villages. In the Ukraine are three Jewish national districts, with 43,000 farmers settled in model collectives. Birobidzhan, with enormous natural resources, was assigned to Jewish settlement in 1930, and now has 14,000 Jewish inhabitants. The Jews in government offices are to be numbered by the hundreds of thousands. "With economic security came a growth in national culture." Whereas in the old days there were no Jewish schools in Russia, there is today a complete system of Jewish language schools embracing 200,000 students. About forty newspapers and magazines, and innumerable books, are published in the Jewish tongue. Jewish theatres, academies, clubs, choruses, are to be found in all the cities and larger towns. Only synagogues are not mentioned in this article in the Moscow *Daily News*. Here, in

the field of religion, is the tragedy of Jewish as of Christian life in the Soviet Republic.

The war-service poll taken among college and university students in this country by the National Student Federation, as inspired by the recent action of the Oxford Union and other English groups, has revealed sentiment which may well bring cheer to the heart of every pacifist. Anti-war conviction is strong, and is more and more taking on the absolutist form. Thus, of more than 11,000 ballots received from 26 colleges, more than 5,000 announce that the voters would not fight under any circumstances. This total matched a total of more than 3,000 who were willing to fight under any circumstances. The remaining 3,000 professed varying degrees of willingness or unwillingness, so that of the total poll *more than half* opposed unqualified war service. The results at certain colleges were strikingly impressive. Thus, at Colgate, a coeducational institution, 263 voted to resist all war service, whereas, only 194 voted in favor of such service. The girls at Vassar voted 301 to 87 in favor of resisting all war service. At the Connecticut College for Women 187 said they would resist war service absolutely, 58 said they would not, and 3 were "uncertain." At the University of Cincinnati 1,742 voted to take no part in any war, and 1,208 said they would resist a draft. At Wesleyan College, Macon, Georgia, 125 voted against war service of any character, and only 6 voted in favor of fighting. At Ohio Wesleyan, also coeducational, 210 voted to refuse all war service, 474 said they would fight only if the mainland were invaded by a foreign foe, and 178 said they would go to any war. West Virginia State College, with only men voting, registered 169 against all wars and only 38 in favor. What happened at certain institutions is significant. Thus, at the College of the City of New York, the faculty interfered and forbade a vote for the obvious reason that they feared a pacifist vote so large as to shock the nation. At Princeton only 26 votes were cast, all against war under all circumstances, because the posters announcing the balloting were torn down and destroyed. Familiar militarist tactics—resort to force when you are afraid of reason! All in all, these results are highly gratifying. This war-ruined world of ours is making some impression on the new generation. When the old men try to make the next war, the young men—and women!—are not going to respond so readily. "God is marching on!"

On the very day that saw the announcement of the new president of Harvard, Professor Conant, died the oldest and best loved member of the faculty, George Herbert Palmer. At his passing Professor Palmer was the sole survivor of that great faculty of scholars, gathered by President Charles William Eliot, which made Harvard the glory of America and one of the glories of the world. Beginning as a teacher of Greek, and remembered to this day for his translation of the "Odyssey," he was early transferred to the philosophical department, where in due course he became a member of that triumvirate—William James, Josiah Royce, and himself—which, with Hugo Munsterberg and George Santayana, constituted the most glorious galaxy of philosophers that this country has ever seen. Never were five more different men! Santayana was the poet and brooding mystic, Munsterberg the practical experimental psychologist, Royce the profound idealistic thinker, James the original, creative pragmatist, interested not in speculative systems but in new ideas and their uses. Palmer stood apart from all these, more the moralist and religionist, and always the incomparable expositor. Himself an exhaustive and authoritative student when he wanted to be, as see his definitive edition of the English poet, George Herbert, he was essentially through many years the master of the art of teaching. We sat at his feet in his famous course, "Phil. 4," and we think of him still as the greatest teacher we have ever known. We remember to this day some of his lectures—on Socrates, for example—which were masterpieces of creative interpretation. No man loved learning more than Palmer, and no man could so quicken this love in the hearts of other men! His relations with President Eliot were those of an intimate fraternity of minds. Always the champion of the elective system, Palmer fought with Eliot the battles which won academic freedom for Harvard and refashioned the educational standards of the nation. The two men walking together through the Yard—Eliot tall, stately, unbending, Palmer short, hurried, informal, peering vaguely with his dim eyes—were one of the unforgettable sights a generation ago. With Palmer's death an era ended—an era as great in the history of Harvard as the Periclean age in the history of Athens.

A World Society

From earliest times there has been a marked tendency toward wider and wider human relationships. This has been due to both the gregarious inclinations of mankind and the necessities of the social situation. Individual anarchy is largely mythical, both among primitive peoples and the primates from which man evolved. Strict individualism is not a feature of any race.

The solidarity of the tribe is expressed in many ways, not the least of which is in tribal action against

other tribes. Occasionally tribal chiefs form loose alliances, or perhaps some unusually strong ruler for a while controls lesser rulers. Among the American Indians certain leagues of neighboring tribes took on a sort of national significance. The Iroquois, including some five tribes, had a federal council of forty-eight, decisions of which were made only on unanimous votes.

In the early Greek and Roman social institutions, from which western government has sprung, larger units sometimes came about in connection with the spread of a religion or the protection of a shrine, or of a festival. One of the most famous of such leagues was the Delphic, comprising twelve cities. While this league was widely known for its humane enactments, it nevertheless fell from grace during war-times and resorted to such inhumane procedure as the poisoning of wells. The Delphic League of Nations came to grief under the corrupt reign of Philip of Macedon. Other examples of the process of inclusion are Egypt, Babylon and Persia, where aggregations of former independent states came more or less under the sway of various conquerors. Especially in ancient Persia do we find a rather democratic imperialism, with the individual states possessing wide autonomy and religious freedom.

The classic days of Rome afford an example of many nations dwelling together in peace under the reign of law,—each state with its distinctive culture, yet all contributing to the culture of the imperial capital. Here was a league of nations, stretching from Great Britain to India, and from Russia to Egypt. While the sanction of this league was force, and membership in it was compulsory, it nevertheless gave Roman law and justice to the world.

Close upon the heels of Roman imperialism came Medieval theocracy which was a government claiming the direct fiat of God, knowing "neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free." Above the emperor sat the vicar of God on earth. Roman law bowed to canon law. Popes made and re-made emperors. But with the Renaissance and the Reformation came a freedom of spirit and a growth of nationalism which blasted the hopes of a universal theocracy.

Following the breakdown of Medieval theocracy, there came a period of nationalistic development which seemed to be the doom of universal government. But soon independent nations found that they could not live unto themselves alone. Artificial barriers made trade and travel difficult, hence confederations, alliances, and federations were formed. The North German Federation, the Swiss Federation, the Federation of the States of America, and, of course, the British Commonwealth of Nations are examples in point.

In every attempt at a larger grouping of peoples, commerce, finance, sovereignty, and sanctions have appeared as major problems. These problems are still with us, but the first two—commerce and finance—are becoming allies of federation, for commerce and finance cannot flourish in restricted fields. The latter two, sovereignty and sanctions, still present difficulties, but both are relative terms. Sovereignty may be limited or abandoned by treaty agreement and, as for sanctions, we are coming to see that there is only one sure sanction and that is public opinion.

Between the passing of the theocracy and the coming of the Hague Conferences, the nations learned many important lessons—chief among them that, while balance of powers may serve to reduce the number of wars, there is nevertheless a corresponding increase in the size and ferocity of wars.

In 1899, the Czar of Russia invited the powers to a conference on the limitation of armaments, in response to which twenty-six nations met at The Hague. The Conference was generally regarded as successful and a second one was expected soon. Due, however, to the Boer and the Russo-Japanese wars, it was not until 1907 that a second conference was held. This time The Hague saw assembled representatives from forty-four nations. A third conference was planned for 1915, but fulfilment was made impossible by the World War.

By 1914 there had been developed an elaborate code of international law but unfortunately only a small part of it had to do with the procedure of peace, and the major portion, which had to do with the procedure of war, was unable to stand the strain of international hostilities. Since the World War, three tremendously significant things have occurred—the formation of the League of Nations, the establishment of the permanent World Court, and the signing of the Pact of Paris. Despite their weaknesses and certain undemocratic features, the League of Nations and the World Court are far-reaching steps in the direction of world organization—and, from the point of view of world peace, the Pact of Paris is by far the most significant treaty yet signed by the pen of man.

Meanwhile, international unions of all sorts have been growing apace. They have to do with communication, transportation, economics, sanitation, press service, and scientific purposes. World organizations, having political as well as economic aims, are the various internationals representing the workers of the world. The International Telegraph Union and the Universal Postal Union are examples of world organizations, without which we could hardly get along today.

Thus do we move slowly but steadily toward a united world.

The universal vision has gleamed through the mists of centuries and it will never fade. It was in the Grand Design of Henry the IV and his minister Sully; in the Alliance of Abbe Saint Pierre; in William Penn's Plan for the Peace of Europe; in Tennyson's

Parliament of Man; in Kant's Eternal Peace; and in Levinson's Outlawry of War.

Broad outlines have been drawn, goals have been flung afar, techniques are in the making, and nothing is surer than the coming of the Federation of the World. CURTIS W. REESE.

Jottings

Inflation will start up business. Sure! Just the way fever starts up the blood. But we never heard fever described or recommended as the road to health.

Well, well! Beer has been with us now for two months, and unemployment is more dreadful than ever before. Yet the "wets" guaranteed that the return of beer would immediately cut down the total of idleness! Can it be possible that beer is not the solution of all our ills?

After all the discussion of recent years, Mother Earth is probably not sensitive about her age. But it must be something of a shock to be told by Prof. John C. Merriam, of the Carnegie Institute, Washington, that she is more than 2,000 million years old, which is several hundred million years older than has been supposed.

We read that a certain man has just invented a combination clarinet and saxophone. The results of unemployment are certainly terrible!

In the old days the saying ran: "Let George do it." Now this saying has been changed to read: "Let *Frank* do it!"

If We Were A Newspaper Editor: (6) *We would recognize that there were some things of front-page importance in this world besides business, politics, and crime.* J. H. H.

The Trial of British Engineers in Moscow

Night by night, in the press rooms adjoining the trial in Moscow, we received the London headlines by telephone, and realized how much of what we daily saw was being suppressed or distorted, and how dangerous this might prove to the peace of the world. To dispel some of these distortions I am writing.

The trial was held in the blue room of the Moscow Hall of Trade Unions, a pleasant audience hall holding some three to four hundred spectators, well lighted, dignified, without any of those revolutionary slogans which distinguish it in the London pictures, and which hark back to a previous conference in the same room. Front rows were reserved for upwards of forty foreign correspondents, and about the same number from Soviet newspapers; behind them the diplomatic corps, the Metro-Vickers employees and general public, including many directors and engineers from factories.

The atmosphere was orderly, occasional laughter being suppressed by the judge. The court, by Soviet custom, had a chairman from the Supreme Court, assisted by two laymen-judges, both of whom were in this case well known engineers, and one of whom, Martens, is internationally known with experience in America. These laymen judges have somewhat the function of our jury in representing the public conscience, but are chosen from social organizations instead of drawn at random, and sit together with the chairman-judge in the final decisions.

The prisoners, sitting not three feet from me on a lower stage beneath the judges, were separated from the audience by a thin rail, and formally guarded by two men in uniform, standing at attention and relieved at intervals. "Surrounded by swords of the GPU" was pure symbolism of the London *Daily Telegraph*. Physically the prisoners looked well; mentally they showed normal alertness, varied by normal somberness. There was not the slightest indication of any past experience of "third degree," and all hints of this were denied by every prisoner to whom it was mentioned, the British prisoner Nordwall explicitly telling "the fine treatment I had in the GPU prison."

The charge of coercion through exhaustion, made in Parliament and based on Monkhouse's statement that he had been questioned eighteen hours without a break, was exploded when the records showed questioning from 11:15 a. m. to 3:15 p. m. followed by two hours dinner, then questioning again from 5:10 p. m. till 1:10 a. m., including forty-five minutes for supper. Monkhouse apologized in court when this total of some twelve hours was read; he stated he had no watch and had judged by the number of meals served. Thornton's questioning was no longer; he admits that it was conducted with only "moral pressure," specifying the showing to him of confessions made by others . . . But while "exhaustion-coercion" figures in Parliament and again in headlines, the correction and apology appear in only one London paper.

The method of court investigation is much less formal than the Anglo-Saxon, but seems equally fair, and considerably less belligerent. The contrasting functions of prosecutor and defender do not take the form of battle royal, but rather of a supplementary search for the full picture. A prosecutor may without losing face state that the course of the trial indicates the innocence of some of the accused; while a defender may equally admit that his client is in whole or in part guilty, explaining his personality and the facts which entitle him to mercy. Both these things happened in the Moscow trial.

Far from indulging in "eight hours of jeers," as a London paper headlines, Prosecutor Vishinsky neither ranted nor greatly raised his voice, but gave scholarly exposition of both British and Soviet law on espionage and bribery, showing that the defendants were guilty by the law of either land. He indulged in shrivelling sarcasm at the expense of Thornton, but failed to demand the death penalty for anyone. He had been chosen precisely for his calmness, instead of the famous Krylenko, a passionate pleader whose "cry for blood" was likely to raise international trouble.

What then was claimed? That certain employees of the Metropolitan Vickers Company, whose service contracts give it access to the power plants which are the very heart of modern industry, were also acting for the British Secret Service, buying secret information about munition plants, mobilization plans and similar matters by bribes to Soviet engineers and mechanics, and at the same time organizing a wrecking group which delayed production, and which prepared for complete breakdown of essential industries in the event of war. Intertwined with these activities were certain others on behalf of Metro-Vickers, such as bribes to overlook defects in equipment supplied by the firm, or to cause such breakdowns as might forestall claims against the firm which would arise if defective equipment worked longer.

What was the evidence? Written confessions by the Englishman, Macdonald, confirmed by him in court; far more deadly written confessions by Thornton (chief installation engineer in the Moscow Office of Metro-Vickers), later partly repudiated and partly admitted in a disgracefully wavering exhibition in court; and full confessions by the Russian accomplices, including those who say they received bribes and the confidential secretary through whom at times the money was sent.

It is the fashion for all Anglo-Saxons to disbelieve all the testimony of the Russians, as either terrorized or bought. For one who believes that a Russian may tell the truth as well as an Englishman, there seemed as good reason to believe the statement made by Gusev, chief of the Zlatacust Power Station, who goes from an honorable job to a ten years' sentence (a far, far longer sentence than was given to the Englishman who, so he says, bribed him), as to believe the Englishmen's denials which brought acquittal. And no one who sat six feet away from Gusev, and watched the hope ooze out of his very bones as the prosecutor analyzed his guilt, and saw the life come back as he exulted to face ten years instead of shooting, could believe that this man, expecting death for his crime, was lightly lying.

So when Macdonald and Gusev both say that thousands of rubles were paid by Thornton through Macdonald to Gusev for military secrets and for organizing wrecking activities; and when both of them testify to joint conversations with Thornton, in which wrecking and espionage were planned; and when Thornton himself has admitted these activities in writing in the preliminary examination, it seems not altogether convincing in court when Thornton denies the facts, though admitting that he signed the confession.

Confessions by Russian accomplices (all of them due to suffer far more than any Briton, by the recent decree giving exceptional punishment to state employees who wreck or take bribes) existed in sufficient number to implicate all the Englishmen arrested, except Gregory, against whom there was only one witness, and whose case was dismissed by the prosecutor himself. There was therefore adequate grounds for arrest and trial. Previously reputable Russian engineers and mechanics had confessed to espionage or concealing defects or wrecking machines for money which they said was paid to them by the several defendants.

Since, however, this Russian evidence is scouted by most Englishmen, though fully believed by most Russians who know what price the men pay, let us pass to the testimony of the men themselves. Macdonald is a confessed spy and wrecker, who says he performed his acts at the behest of his superior, Thornton, for whom he acted as intermediary in bribing Russians. He has been given two years' sentence by the Soviet court, while his fellow-Englishmen have abandoned him as a hopeless deserter of their joint denial.

Thornton's case is most complex of all. While in the GPU prison he signed many confessions, including one "deadly document," which stated:

> All our spying operations in the USSR are directed by the British Intelligence Service through the agent C. S. Richards, managing director of Metro-Vickers Export, Ltd. Spying operations on USSR territory were directed by myself and Monkhouse, representatives of the above mentioned British firm . . . On the instructions of C. S. Richards, given me to this end, British personnel were gradually drawn into the spying organization after their arrival on USSR territory . . ."

He gives the list of twenty-seven such "spies" with the activities of each. All the British defendants were included.

Thornton in open court admitted that he had written this document with his own hand and signed it, and stated several times that he had done so "under no pressure." He claims to have been "nervous," "excited"; later he claimed to have been frightened; still later, when encouraged by the firm stand of his colleagues, he said he had signed under "moral pressure," by which he said he meant that he was shown Macdonald's and Gusev's confession and told it would be better for him to confess. Are these adequate reasons for an innocent man to write such a document?

The other Englishmen, Monkhouse, Cushny, Nordwall and Gregory, grimly denied all charges. Monkhouse indeed admitted that he "knew about the bribes," which he called "gifts not bribes," and which he personally disdained to give. He admitted that his predecessor as Metro-Vickers' representative in U. S. S. R. had a special bribing fund used to make the recipient favorably disposed in his reports on Metro-Vickers' equipment. He admitted that there had been "perhaps twenty cases" of breakdowns due to defects in this equipment, but he said most of them were very minor breakdowns. In his concluding speech, clearly designed to appeal, not to the court, but to the British press, he emphatically and eloquently denied either espionage, wrecking or bribery.

None of the denying Englishmen were cross-examined with any severity. And none of those who denied got any sentence except expulsion

from the country, though Russians for receiving bribes from them were heavily punished. No Briton was punished for anything save what he himself confessed; Thornton got three years, Macdonald two years. These sentences are in reality more merciful than freedom. Men under GPU sentences do not go to jail. They go to construction jobs and power plants in distant places and ply their trade of engineer under surveillance, where the scorn which would make life hell for them in any free society will be absent.

Yet every Soviet citizen believes that the "deadly document" written by Thornton corresponds to facts. The newspapers publish caustic accounts of famous British agents, Lockhart, Riley, Laurence, who could "lie with a calm face and a clear conscience." Other than this they say little, being held in severe check. The Communist Party has now the thankless task of explaining the verdict to factory meetings, where it is most unpopular for its leniency. But they will explain it adequately and placate the workers by telling the truth.

The truth—there was just one reason why the cross-examination was softened, why the urbane Vishinsky replaced Krylenko, why the press was strictly censored and the judges' verdict sentenced (and very lightly) only those Englishmen who had themselves confessed. I heard it often, from Soviet "responsible workers," around and during the trial,

> Once a single shot at Sarajevo started a World War. Now the world is a tinder-box and the London press is mad. Are we sincere when we declare for peace in Geneva? If so, we must now make sacrifice for peace. Moreover, we have still our new built industries to conquer.

ANNA LOUISE STRONG

Moscow, Russia

Why Are Jews Persecuted?

The first thing that I would emphasize in answering this question, just now made horribly, incredibly real by the Hitler outrages in Germany, is the simple fact, not often recognized or remembered, that the Jews are not alone in their experience of persecution. The agony which they endure is an agony which they have shared with other racial and religious groups. The Jews, for example, were not the first to see their country ruined, their capital leveled to the ground, and their people scattered to distant countries and among alien races. This was the fate which Rome visited upon Carthage three hundred years before Titus visited it upon Jerusalem. The Jews are not the only people who have been tortured and slain for heresy. What they suffered at the hands of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Christian martyrs suffered at the hands of Nero and Diocletian. The Jews were not the only victims of the Spanish Inquisition. The pains they endured were the same pains which were ruthlessly inflicted upon thousands and thousands of perfectly good Christians. The Jews were not the only people to be expelled in a body from the only country they ever knew. The expulsion of the Huguenots from France in the reign of Louis XIV was not less terrible than the expulsion of the Israelites from Spain in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. More than a thousand years ago, the Christian Albigenses in southern France were utterly exterminated by the bloody sword of Simon de Montfort. Less than one hundred years ago, the Bahaists of Moslem Persia were ravaged in a massacre which, among other things, took the lives of thirty thousand men and women in a single day. The same period which witnessed the Russian pogroms witnessed as well the Bulgarian atrocities and the Armenian massacres. In Germany today the Jews are meeting no more ghastly a fate than the Socialist Republicans on the one hand and the Red Communists on the other. The Jews, in other words, have no monopoly of suffering. They are not the only people who have been persecuted by their fellows. Which means that there must be certain general causes of persecution which apply to all peoples under the same given conditions! Yet the Jews are unique in this hideous field of oppression and death—unique in the sense that their sufferings are universal and eternal. They have been despised and rejected not in one place but in every place; they have been tortured and butchered not in one age but in every age. Which would seem to imply that there are some special factors at work in their case which for some reason do not appear anywhere else! The problem is to discover, on the one hand, what are the causes which lead to persecution in general; and, on the other hand, what are the specific causes which operate in the life of Israel.

Before coming to grips with this problem, I want to answer a question which always appears whenever we encounter the riddle of discrimination or prejudice against the Jews. Why are Jews persecuted? Because, we are invariably told, the Jews are an objectionable, even an obnoxious, people. In their natural condition, they are dirty and unclean. In their higher condition, they still remain coarse, vulgar, and unrefined. Always, we are informed, they are loud-mouthed, arrogant and intrusive. Jews have no standards of culture and no good manners, and are thus a constant offense to decency. In their personal habits they are unendurable. In their business methods they are shrewd and cunning, and almost invariably unscrupulous. Exploiters not only of other but of their own people, they are utterly materialistic and have no higher passion in life than that of money-making. Nobody can live, or at least wants to live, with Jews. Wherever they move in, everybody else moves out. They are objectionable even to themselves, for Portuguese and German Jews are frequently the first to flee from the company of Russian and Polish Jews. These people are obnoxious, that is all. If persecuted it is for the same reason that weeds are torn up from a garden.

What now are we to say in answer to this indictment? I would say, with great emphasis, two things:

In the first place, the accusation is untrue. In his famous speech in the British House of Commons on "The Conciliation of America," the great liberal orator, Edmund Burke, made the immortal statement that he did not "know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." What Burke thus said of Americans is true as well of Jews. Neither against this people, nor against any people, can a charge of universal application be brought. I am willing to concede that there are many objectionable Jews, just as there are many objectionable persons in every social group. I am willing to concede that I have seen indi-

*An address spoken at the Community Church, New York City.

vidual Jews who were as obnoxious as any Gentiles I ever met in my life. I am willing to concede that there are whole sections of the Jewish people, those who are only a generation or two removed from the European ghettos, who are objectionable to all persons of culture and refinement. A great American Jew has himself drawn in vivid colors the ugly picture of these fellow-tribesmen of his in the pages of that unforgettable novel, which most of us read some years ago, "The Rise of David Levinsky." I am even willing to concede that the offenses of offensive Jews are of a peculiarly distinctive and emphatic character, due, may I hasten to point out, to the distinctive and emphatic character of the miserable lives which they have been forced to live. If a Jew is dirty, it is because he has not yet escaped from the ghetto or the slum in which the world has doomed him to exist. If he is aggressive, it is because he has been forced to develop this quality as a condition of mere survival. If he is financially unscrupulous, it is because he is the descendant of a tribe which for centuries was denied any opportunity to earn an honest living, and was therefore forced to exist by the sheer exercise of its wits. But these qualities, and similar qualities, are not racial in character. They are not characteristic of Jews as such. On the contrary, they are qualities which appear in all individuals in all groups which have not yet escaped from the social doom of prejudice and outlawry, and especially from the curse of economic servitude. As well point to a man arising from a torture-machine and blame him for his bleeding flesh and broken limbs and shattered nerves, as to point to a Jew and blame him for the attributes of his ghetto existence. If there are Jews today who are spiritually bruised and battered, demoralized and dehumanized, it is not because they are Jews, but rather because they are men and women who bear the stripes which generations of persecutors have laid upon them.

The fact of the matter is that Jews, if given a chance, are quite as other men. The Jews of Germany, for example, who have resided in that country for a thousand years, represent today the finest blood, ablest brains, and noblest culture of the nation. German Jews are the leaders in every walk of German science, art, and politics. These German Jews labor today under no more serious disability in the Hitler regime than the fact that they are with few exceptions the leaders of German life. I think it pretty late in the day to undertake the defense of our Jewish brethren, but since the question is up, let me say this! There are few Gentiles in this country, I venture to say, who have had a greater opportunity than I have had in recent years to know Jews and to share their life. I have preached in their synagogues, lived in their homes, enjoyed their friendship. I cherish them, admire them, love them, and am thus able to testify to their gentleness and refinement, their noble culture and artistic genius, their domestic virtue and business integrity, their utter fidelity to the ethical traditions and ideals which are the peculiar heritage of their tribe. The plea of Shylock in the play—"have not the Jews eyes, hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions"—applies to the whole character of the Jew. The Israelite is a man among men, one of our human family, and if he sometimes shows the worst, he quite as often shows the best that human nature can afford.

My second answer to this miserable charge is that it is beside the point! We cannot persecute men because of their moral imperfections. If we started to do so, there would be no end of terror, and no group among us all would be safe from outrage. As a matter of fact, we do not persecute men for this alleged reason. The personal qualities of individuals has not entered into the oppression of other persecuted peoples, such as the Christian martyrs, the Protestant heretics, the Armenian victims. In the same way have they never really entered into the persecution of Jews. What has happened is that, as a result of an historical and psychological process, which I shall describe in just a moment, we have been led persistently to torture and slay the people of Israel. Having committed this crime which we know in our hearts to be damnable, we have instinctively sought for reasons which would explain our action. We have therefore proceeded to rationalize what we have done in an earnest attempt to justify it. The ascription to the Jews, in other words, of obnoxious personal qualities is nothing more nor less than a deliberate endeavor to make defensible what is otherwise indefensible. It is an expression of our desperate desire to commend to the world's approval what we fear must be condemned. Having killed the Jew, we prove that he was not fit to live! The charge, of course, is as fallacious as it is wicked. The real reasons for the persecution of Israel lie deeper and in quite other directions.

This brings us immediately to our main question. I have said that there are general causes and special causes for the persecution of the Jew. I shall undertake to name one cause in each of these two groups, the one in each case which is fundamental, therefore characteristic and of supreme importance.

From the standpoint of the general causes involved, may I say that Jews are persecuted, as all persecuted peoples are persecuted, primarily because they are *different*. There is a herd instinct in man which resents any variation of type, and which prompts him to stamp out such variation as dangerous to his own survival. This herd instinct, I may say, is native to animals as well as to men, and therefore must be regarded as in origin a part of our animal inheritance. Place a strange dog, for example, in a kennel, and he will immediately be set upon and destroyed by the kennel's inmates. The white crow, a lighter variation of the black species, has practically disappeared because invariably he is pecked to death by his outraged companions. The black sheep is not allowed to live with the rest of the flock, and thus, poor animal, just because of his dark-hued coat, has become a symbol for evil qualities which have never been his at all. What animals thus do in their herd life, men do as well. From the beginning of time, we have instinctively hated the stranger and feared the man who for any reason lives apart. The heretic in religion is the perfect illustration of the working of this impulse. This heretic, in all the personal qualities of his life, is quite like other men. But he dares to think for himself, to hold his own beliefs, to worship at his own altar, and forthwith the hand of every man is raised against him! Nonconformity, in other words, is the unpardonable sin.

Now, Jews are the most distinctive of all peoples on the earth. They are not only different, but they seem to *want* to be different. They are obstinate, stubborn, stiff-necked, heroic, sublime in their resolution to walk in their own path, to be faithful to their own character, and to follow their own way of life. Their difference from other men was rooted in the beginning

in the discovery of and a devotion to one God whose will was the will of righteousness. In their loyalty to this deity, the Jews refused to conform to the universal custom of accepting the gods of other peoples when it was convenient or useful to do so. They steadfastly clung to their own God to the exclusion of foreign gods, and thus, from the earliest moment of their recorded history, were hated by the worshippers of these other gods. This difference, which had become as it were a part of history, was accentuated after the dispersion when the Jews undertook the stupendous task of surviving in a world in which they had no place. Ten tribes of the Jews had already failed in this attempt, or else had never undertaken it, and thus are remembered only as "the Lost Tribes." But the two remaining tribes resolved heroically to live, and have succeeded through the colossal achievement of maintaining their own essential individuality in the face of a world's displeasure. Thus, separated from their temple, they reared their synagogues wherever they found themselves, and there continued the worship of their God. Torn from their homes, they built their family life around the sanctified traditions of their race, and thus made this life itself a sacred thing. Driven from their native soil, they established Israel within their hearts, and thus on whatever soil they stood made this soil their own. And always, wherever they were, they cherished the Messianic dream of the restoration of Israel and the return to Zion. Thus, through all these centuries of their scattered existence, the Jews have kept themselves separate and apart. In their hopes, their dreams, their ideals, their loyalty to themselves, they have refused to surrender to the world, or to conform to its alien and ignoble ways.

This attitude of the Jews, however, is not the whole of the story. For it is the irony of this circumstance that persecution itself has inevitably emphasized, deepened and perpetuated the very difference which was the occasion of persecution. What the Jews, in other words, deliberately chose for themselves as a discipline of faith, was straightway imposed upon them by their neighbors as a punishment of fate. Through the long night of medieval oppression, the Jews were driven apart into an exile they never desired or could have accomplished for themselves. Down into the dark slums and noisome dens of the ghettos, they were driven as rats into the sewers of the streets. Great walls were reared about their homes, through the gates of which they were never allowed to escape. Badges of infamy and garments of disgrace were laid upon their persons that, as veritable lepers, they should be cast out of the society of men. For more than a thousand years they struggled on as outlaws and pariahs, hated centers of moral pestilence and contagion. In later years, within a century and a half, they were released and, under varying degrees of disability and prejudice, have mingled with other men. To the influences of modern life they have quickly adapted themselves, and into the culture of every nation where they have been allowed to function, have poured the rich genius of their spirit. But always they have been a people apart. In modern times as in ancient, they have rigorously, steadfastly, bravely been true to themselves, and thus preserved themselves. Both vountarily and involuntarily, therefore, they have lived in a world and culture of their own.

This, I am persuaded, is the fundamental reason for the persecution of the Jews, as of all other peoples who have ever suffered. It is not the character of the Jew but his difference which has made him objectionable to the Gentile. This difference, may I add as a very important point, might not have been so obnoxious if only it had been synonymous with a proved or admitted inferiority. Many a "different" people has been able to survive, even under conditions of grievous inequality and oppression, by accepting the brand of inferior origin and character. This is true of the great mass of American Negroes in the South today, and it has been true for thousands of years of the Untouchables of India. Both these groups, as well as other groups of the same kind, have learned to avoid persecution and destruction, whatever the burden of their outlawry, by accepting in the life of the society of which they are a part of the status of inferiority. But the Jew has never been willing to be inferior. Indeed, he has seemed to take a positive delight in being superior. Challenged by the violence and hate of the Christian world, he has matched these weapons of tyranny with his intelligence and spirit, and therewith has managed not only to survive, but in the end to climb to the highest seats of power and influence. The one unforgettable offense of the Jews in Germany today, as I have said, is their success in excelling their contemporaries in every walk of life. Not only in banking and business, in industry and commerce, but also in art and literature, in philosophy, politics, science, they have made themselves the leaders of their time. And what is true in Germany is true also in other countries! In 1927, for example, the *British Journal of Psychology* made a systematic investigation of the intelligence of children attending the public schools in England, and found as a result of its survey that "Jewish children were conspicuously superior to all other classes." A similar investigation was conducted at Columbia University in 1928, and a similar finding was registered. More recently Professor Terman, of California, undertook to sift out from the pupils in the public schools of that state the one thousand most gifted boys and girls. When he had isolated these children, he found that there were twice as many Jewish boys and girls among them as were warranted by the ratio of Jews to the total population of California.

Now, what are we going to do with people of this kind? How are we going to live with them or get along with them? How are the Gentiles going to protect themselves from such outrageous competition? Is it not adding insult to injury for Jews to beat Gentiles in this fashion at their own game? Not to be like Gentiles is bad enough, but to be better than Gentiles is simply insufferable. After all, we Gentiles are human, and it is not surprising if we resent this outrageous sort of treatment and rebel against it in terms of persecution. But I would not be flippant or even ironical in a discussion of a problem which at bottom is so terrible with agony. What I would emphasize is the truth involved—the basic truth, that persecution at bottom is invariably the product of a haunting and terrifying sense of inferiority which springs from the fact of difference. Even if the group which is different from ourselves is *not* superior, we are afraid that it may be. The mere fact of difference, especially if persistently and proudly maintained, seems to be a reflection upon our own character and attainments, and thus the inferiority complex, whether it has any basis in reality or not, is begun. What we have here is simply an extreme attempt to keep people in their

place. The persecutor, says Lewis Browne, in his book "Stranger than Fiction," is trying to convince "his own wretched self that the person flaunting his difference must be far, far inferior." We persecute "different" people, in other words, in order that we may prove them to be inferior and ourselves superior.

This brings us to the special cause of persecution which is involved in the experience of the Jewish people. What I have in mind, as you must anticipate, is the guilt of the Jews, in the eyes of the Christian world, in rejecting and slaying Jesus. The phrase, "Christ-killers," has again and again lifted the sword of massacre against the helpless kindred of the Nazarene.

Of course, there is no truth in this indictment of Israel by Christendom, save as the indictment has been deliberately forged against a whole people in the interest of a hard-and-fast theology. What happened in Palestine is a perfectly plain and also commonplace chapter of history. A young radical, Jesus, appeared among the common people of his country. This radical, profoundly moved by the injustices of the times, began to preach revolt and to organize agitation. It was not long before he was arrested and placed on trial for sedition. The Nazarene, in other words, by the fire of his word and the courage of his example, made himself dangerous to church and state, and straightway was put to death by these two traditional instruments of tyranny and oppression. This drama is nothing strange. It has been enacted again and again in a hundred different times and places. But when in any other case has it been made the occasion of persecution? Imagine our murdering Greeks today because Socrates was put to death in Athens! Who thinks of torturing and massacring Italians because men of Italian breed and speech martyred the great Giordano Bruno? What would we think if a persecution was begun against Americans because our fathers killed John Brown, the one supreme martyr of American history?

No persecution of this sort would ever have been visited upon the Jews, in the name of Jesus or of any other prophet, had it not been for the theologizing of the Nazarene's story. Look at what has happened! Very early after the death of Jesus, the Christian church transformed the story of his life into a sacred drama of cosmic history. The church started out by stealing the Old Testament, making it a part of Christian scriptures, and rewriting or reinterpreting it in the interest of the Christian tradition. It continued its work by appropriating Jesus of Nazareth, transforming him from the son of Mary into the son of God, and making him the Saviour of mankind. It then took the crucifixion and changed it over into the atonement as a blood sacrifice for the human race. Lastly, it seized upon the Jews and deliberately made the whole race the villain of the cosmic play. Their first offense was in not recognizing Jesus, one of their own, for what he was; and their second offense was in destroying him and thus raising their hands against Almighty God himself. Through the exigencies of a fantastic theology of this type did the Christians lay on the Jews the vengeance of the Most High, and appoint themselves the agents of this vengeance upon the earth. At the very start of Christianity, in other words, this new and wonderful religion was made synonymous with Anti-Semitism.

No words can exaggerate the tragedy of this historical accident, nor its significance in the annals of our western civilization. The logic of Orthodox Christianity is Anti-Semitism. Just to the extent that Christians believe their own faith, they must hate and persecute Jews. Only to the extent that they reject or remain indifferent to their own dogmas, can they be friendly to Israel. Which means that Christianity, by which I mean the theology of the church and not the teachings of the great founder of the faith, is itself the special cause of Israel's agony! I count it something more than a coincidence that the one country in the world today where the Jew is absolutely free of the age-old burden of persecution and prejudice, is that one country where the Orthodox Christian church has been wiped out by the fiat of government. I do not argue from this, even for the sake of my Jewish friends, that Christianity should be destroyed. I do insist, however, that the Christian faith as embodied in the creeds and organized in the churches, must be cast aside as a superstition, and the religion of Jesus restored to the simple love and brotherhood of the gospel of the Jew of Galilee.

Such are the two great and fundamental causes of the persecution of the Jews. There is the general cause inherent in that distinctive or "different" character which has made Israel through all the centuries a "people." In addition, there is this special cause inherent in the theological doctrine of Christendom. To these must be added other causes, both general and special, which play their part, though they be less important, in this vast tragedy. Of these I have time to name but one.

I refer to the fact that the Jews have always been, and still are today, a weak people. In the ancient days, when they lived within the borders of their own country, they were one of the smallest and feeblest of the nations of the eastern world. Israel lay like a little village, so to speak, on the great highway between Egypt to the west and Assyria and Babylonia to the east. Over this great highway trampled the mighty legions of contending kingdoms. When Rome conquered the earth, Palestine was incorporated as a mere corner of the Empire, and her population lost as a negligible unit in a vast congeries of peoples. After the dispersion, the Jews of course were nothing but an alien group of helpless men and women, living on sufferance in the far flung lands to which in despair and agony they had fled. Even in our own time, they remain one of the weakest of all earth's peoples—a mere sixteen millions among the nearly two thousand millions of earth inhabitants! Always, therefore, today as yesterday, they have been feeble, helpless, "easy marks" for the lust and hate of those who would injure and despoil them. Wanderers upon earth's surface, they have no government to defend them, no flag to enshroud them, no land to which to flee. Even as citizens in their new-found countries, loyal citizens, who have unselfishly served the state in days of peace and heroically died for it in days of war, they may be cast out at any time, as in Germany at this hour, and find none on all this planet to give them aid or comfort. Invariably they have lived, and still live, as a minority group among peoples not their own, and thus invariably they have been, and still are, attacked and ravished with absolute impunity. Whenever, on occasion of great excitement, as in Hitler's Germany, it is necessary to stir men with agitation and to mobilize them for action, the Jews are right at hand to serve as scapegoats. When men want to hate somebody, kill some-

body, lynch somebody, to magnify their own greatness by humiliating and persecuting others, they always turn against those among them who are most helpless. In some places it is Negroes, or Catholics, or Communists; in all places it may be Jews. Anti-Semitism is cruel, but most of all it is cowardly. Chief among all the skulking bullies of the world are the men who, with all power and opinion on their side, hunt out the stricken sons of Israel, and murder them as those who have no strength to defend and save themselves. Such is our answer to the question, Why are Jews Persecuted? May I summarize the whole statement in a single sentence! The Jews are a people of noble history, fine intelligence, exalted spiritual genius, who suffer persecution because, amid conditions of far exile and fearful want, they remain steadfastly loyal to their own racial and religious traditions and bear the burden of the vilest slander known in human experience. Always a minority amid alien peoples, and therefore the weakest among the tribes of earth, these Jews have been made to write in their own tears and blood the most tragic tale of history, and by their sheer endurance of it have made this most tragic tale to be also the most heroic. I know of nothing to compare with the story of this tribe, save only the story of Jesus, of which it is the unending repetition.

Is this story never to be ended? It can be ended by the Jew, if he will only change himself—forget his lineage, forsake his faith, betray his God. But by what right do we ask the Jew thus to commit racial suicide? Why should we not ourselves end his horror by ending our own shame? The remedy for the persecution of the Jews is very simple. It is that we shall live the spirit of our faith—by which I mean that we shall henceforth treat all Jews today as we would treat one Jew, were He, the Nazarene, to come again to earth. Why not, *why not?* For what a dead Jew in the gutters of Berlin is to a Nazi at this hour is only what a dead Jew on the hill of Calvary outside Jerusalem was to a Roman at that ancient hour. It is time that the crucifixion were no more, else to the end of time shall the Jews themselves be the only persons worthy of the Christ. I can hear them speak today, in this latest hour of terror and of death, in the words of the poet:

O man of mine own people, I alone
Among these alien ones know thy face,
I who have felt the kinship of our race
Burn in me, as I sit where they intone
Thy praises—those who, striving to make known
A God for sacrifice, have missed the grace
Of thy sweet human meeting in its place,
Thou art our blood-bond and our own.

Are we not sharers of thy passion? Yea,
In spirit-anguish closely by thy side
We have drained the bitter cup, and, tortured, felt
With thee the bruising of each heavy welt.
Every land is our Gethsemane,
A thousand times have we been crucified.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Study Table

The Epic of John Brown

It seems to be a truism that, the more effortless the era, the more pregnant it is with pictures of its past. And our own age, noted for eccentric biography, has produced nothing in this line so *outré* as "God's Angry Man."* Woven with Sophoclean splendor about John Brown, already glorified of writers diverse as Edwin Arlington Robinson and Stephen Vincent Benet, it has Sandburg's homespun lyricism, the dour dramatic asides of O'Neill's "Desire Under the Elms," subtle characterization worthy of Sherwood Anderson; and it is illuminated throughout by a spectral flame caught from the proverbial *Inferno*. Mingled with these conflicting qualities, and merging them with each other, is an atmosphere of brooding mystery which—saturating especially the Ossawatomie massacres—reaches heights that are Shakespearean. Let this preludal passage set the tone:

"Slowly, unbearably, the hours crept to their end. There was no curve in the day to ease the restlessness of the waiting men; no rise of the sun to height and then the waning that would give them a sense of passing time. The day was dead gray, each moment of it; it stood still under a blanched sky. They had only the writhing weight of their thoughts.

"'Jesus!' cried Hen Thompson suddenly. 'I can't stand this waiting!'

"'We'll wait,' said the old man, gray as slate. . . .

"Six o'clock came. The air had been turning warmer; now suddenly the mist began to fade and clear blue patches showed through. Soon there was a great swept twilight sky, and over the western trees a deep rose flush from the departed sun. Oliver stared into the glow and passed a trembling hand over his forehead. A little later full night was down over the gully and a great warm star was low in the sky. There would be a moon.

"They waited, watching the old man's every move. They were near the end of endurance. But he sat, still and smoldering. In good time, he thought, he would say: Men, get your arms. In good time, in His time, the Lord's work would be done. . . ."

Repudiating, then, either the "flight of fancy" or the formal biography, Mr. Ehrlich, wielding a trenchant pen, tells the fantastic story of that life which began in Connecticut hills and walked its awful way through the shambles of Ossawatomie to the Calvary after Harper's Ferry—all this in page after page redolent with fresh loam, pungent with dark dialogue, somber with evening river shadows, crimson with carven August moons. Repressed America, her long-smoldering passions ready to trumpet forth into tumultuous civil war, provides the background for this Arabian tale; and the mutterings of Sumter, heard ominously on the horizon, accompany the grim protagonist on his path—sullen, stalking symbol of greater horrors yet to come.

Trooping in his wake is a supporting cast at once competent and commanding: Brown's oaken ancestors; his Austrian janizary; his ten formidable children and their relations, each one a character out of O'Neill; the Harper's Ferry raiders, twenty-one in all; Frederick Douglas; Robert E. Lee; Jeb Stuart; Henry David Thoreau; Abraham Lincoln. All play their parts to the uttermost, duly subordinated to the *deus ex machina:* and the resultant drama is an appropriate prologue to the cataclysm of secession.

But it is John Brown himself who is the cynosure of all eyes. Sinister as the sadistic Cream stalking his prey on the Lambeth pavements, granitely ruthless as Cromwell in striking it down, loving as Jesus liberating the oppressed—he displays in horrible coherence all the frightful contradictions of human nature. Bible and bowie knife in his bosom, he goes about his ghastly work, firmly convinced, as he piles Pelion on Ossa to

*"God's Angry Man," by Leonard Ehrlich. Published by Simon and Schuster, 1932.

provoke civil catastrophe, that he mans an eternal Armageddon to battle for the Lord. Of all recent character creations, most impressive is Mr. Ehrlich's dramatization (rich in fecund flash-backs) of the tangled tortuous soul that slobbered over symphony music and slaughtered innocent men in cold blood—a romantic biography more romantic than a romance and more biographical than any biography. There is a soberness about the whole business that forbids frivolity. And yet there is also a certain cosmic irony in the strophies of John Brown's epilogue, spoken by Col. Preston at the scaffold:

"So perish all such enemies of Virginia! all such enemies of the Union! all such enemies of the human race!"—unwilling acknowledgment that the supremacy of Virginian civilization was drawing to a close; that the race shackles upon which it had reared its victorious throne were already shattered; and that the Union under which that throne had arisen was at an end.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

Book Notes

Socialist Planning and a Socialist Program. Edited by Harry W. Laidler. Falcon Press, New York. $2.00.

In which some thirty men analyze and criticize the existing order and try to show how a planned economy may be brought about with a minimum of friction and a maximum of co-operation of hand and brain workers.

Security by Disarmament, by G. Norman Robbins. Williams & Norgate, Ltd. London 3s. 6d. Net.

Security is here presented as conditioned on truth in relations between individuals, races, and nations.

The Opening of the House, by Abbott Peterson. The Beacon Press, Inc., Boston. By mail $1.10.

A list of the Chaplains of the House of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from the adoption of the constitution in 1780 to the present, together with a selection of the House prayers of Abbott Peterson.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Outcasts

My brother's body is crooked and thin.
He goes to bed with a shape called "Sin,"
(A snake that writhes in a brilliant skin,
So warmly painted but cold!)

His father's meat-and-drink was gin.
His witless mother in grime and din
Had spawned a brood that could not but win
A curse from the righteous fold.

But who was it left them up to the chin
In pitch? Who stole the bread from their bin;
And rented them bunks in a filthy inn,
And rubbed his hands when he sold?

Ah! Well, if we ever should once begin
To question the who and the why herein,
We would freeze the dullard's jeering grin
For the tale would be sourly told.

We'd meet with a judge in the role of a djinn;
A pillar of state turned harlequin;
And under the priestly capuchin
A devil over-bold.

And far enough back we should find them twin,
The leprous beggar, the mandarin,
The harlot, the jeweled heroine,
The drowning man and the man within
The ship with the laden hold.

MARY OWEN LEWIS.

A Factory Worker

Stitch faster, quick, make fingers fly.
From whirling motor comes the cry.
The factory wheels with deafening roar
Urge on production more and more.

A man once came with a watch to take
The count of all the strokes I make.
My hands long trained, then quickened pace;
I felt the chance to win a race.
He made a note and went away,
And now we have a cut in pay.
They know my highest speed in work.
To urge us on, so we'll not shirk,
A bonus may be earned for speed
If the present mark we can exceed.
My rate is now the best it can be.
The bonus does no good to me.

The gleaming wheels turn on and on
The early hope in work is gone.
Stitch faster, quick, make fingers fly.
From whirling motor comes the cry.

ALICE GARDNER SPENCER.

Eternal Windows

As the eyes
Are windows of the soul,
And stars the windows of heaven,
Opening to the eternal,
So are the children of light
To those who seek the truth.

ELIZABETH VOSS.

Closed Doors

There's this that I have felt about closed doors:
Painful as wounds that lacerate the heart,
Cold winds, carousing across sodden floors
Of Autumn, are more softly-shod, and start
A brusker kindness than the barred insolence
Of doors shut to the touch of friendliness.

Sunshine is compassionate, fraternal.
Fences cannot stop the grass adventuring.
Rivers circle wide for banks and parks.
Nature, like happiness, is footloose, free;
Spring does not hedge herself with marks
Against intrusion of jovial company.

Roads wind in and out, forever going;
Sea-winds sweep the land with salty blowing;
Clouds entwine fair fancies in the sky—
There is no trail outlined where wild geese fly.
Birds put all such snobberies to rout—
Hearts ban themselves by shutting others out.

JOSEPH LEISER.

A Paean for Her

We want to give the gallant soul who bore us
Some cause for being glad that we were born.
To her who held the pennant high before us
We want to be a blossom, not a thorn.

To justify by love and gracious giving
The agony, the cares that she endured.
To make a gorgeous paean out of living,
Be lavish with the life her pain procured.

LEONORA OWSLEY HERMAN.

Correspondence

An Educational Center

Editor of UNITY:

The All-World Gandhi Fellowship, of which Dr. John Haynes Holmes is President, and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Vice President, has opened an Educational Centre at Mount Kisco, New York, for the purpose of training cadets for the Peace Army. The Centre has been called a West Point for Peace Workers, and has recruited a staff of experts to conduct studies in the technique of peace education, emphasizing research into the non-violence methods of Mahatma Gandhi with whom the organization is in direct contact.

Studies will be conducted informally by practiced workers in the Peace Movement, in social and industrial affairs, and in the arts as instruments of a social reconstruction. The organization is free of any party attachments. Its members express a desire "to work for a co-operative, spiritually motivated society, freed from class, sectarian and racial prejudice, and dedicated to the realization of peace-mindedness and the elimination of militaristic force in the settlement of national differences."

Fellowship Centre plans to demonstrate a new-low in living costs: the staff works without salaries: all guests and students share in the work of cleaning and up-keep. The old farmhouse was put in condition by a group of unemployed seamen, and furnished by voluntary gifts.

The organizers of the Centre have recognized the futility of seeking funds during the financial disturbance, and have resorted to barter to obtain the goods and services needed. In this way the twenty-one room farmhouse has been partly equipped. Persons seriously interested, but without funds, are asked what they can bring and in this way house-linens, secretarial service, automobile, as well as the teaching services of the college professors are being obtained.

The Centre is located in one of the beauty spots of Westchester, three miles from Mount Kisco Railroad Station.

Details concerning membership and available service can be obtained from the All-World Gandhi Fellowship, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

The Centre is now open to receive a limited number of resident students.

WILLIAM H. BRIDGE, *Director.*

Sentences from Unity's Correspondence

I

Editor of UNITY:

Attached find my check for one year's renewal to UNITY. It is a most provocative paper and even though times are hard and the depression is on I need it as a tonic. It stimulates thinking.

ELMER WARD COLE.

South Bend, Indiana.

II

Editor of UNITY:

Enclosed find a long delayed back payment, will send balance next month. Your Jottings are like passages in Scripture; a few words but strong in truth.

L. B. H.

Rockford, Illinois.

III

Editor of UNITY:

This paper is invaluable.

M. G. M.

Evanston, Ill.

IV

Editor of UNITY:

Enclose check for renewal with gratitude for your service in behalf of a fairer world.

GEORGE SCHUMM.

New Brighton, S. I.

V

Editor of UNITY:

I beg to enclose herewith Francs. 105. as my subscription to your esteemed journal which is more like a views-paper than a newspaper. Almost all the articles, appearing in it, seem to justify its existence as a harbinger of peace. I sincerely regret my inability to help such an ideal journal as is yours, at a time of world-wide depression when it needs from its friends and sympathizers more of active sympathy than of mere lip-homage. Nevertheless I hope that I shall be of some help to your journal in the near future, either by getting some subscribers for it, or by contributing something towards its maintenance. At present I am a student here at the University of Montpellier and as such I cannot help UNITY more than only by remaining its subscriber.

I wish UNITY a bright and glorious future.

AMBALAL D. PATEL.

Montpellier, France.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 182)

are interested in the political question. . . .

"We are anxious that the Constitution which we accept here should be discussed among ourselves . . . I do want to discuss these things with Congress men, and when I talk of Congress men, it is impossible for me to discuss, it is impossible for Mr. Jayakar to discuss, what we have been doing here with any Congress men so long as Mahatma Gandhi is in jail. . .

"If the situation in India has improved. . . . why keep Mr. Gandhi in jail? . . . If it is worse, then surely you must adopt a different policy, for your present policy has been a failure. If it is better than during the last twelve months then you have no business to keep political prisoners in jail. With whom are we to discuss these questions? With ourselves? With those who have been dissenting from the Government? On these grounds I do ask you for the release of Mahatma Gandhi and the release of political prisoners—men who have gone to jail for their political opinions and for their convictions."

Mr. Jayakar added:

"Assuming that they went back with a constitution satisfactory to the progressive minds of India, it would be necessary to carry on propaganda for the acceptance of that constitution. For that conversations and discussions would be necessary with the leaders, which would be impossible in prison, and therefore Mr. Gandhi and the other political prisoners must be released.

"If the Government of India or the English Government expected to extort humiliating conditions from Mr. Gandhi, they would never get them. A settlement with honorable conditions they would get without much difficulty. If the idea was to crush the Congress movement, he doubted the possibility. The Congress movement was an aspiration, and you could never crush an aspiration. But if they wanted an honorable settlement he felt sure it was possible to get it."

The same evening, at the Round Table Conference, Sir Tej Sapru again reviewed the work done by the Conference, and the present situation in India consequent thereon. Concluding a general survey, he said:

"Now, Secretary of State, however good the constitution may be, ultimately the question which arises is: Is that constitution going to be acceptable to the people of India? There was nothing wiser than the remark made by the Prime Minister in his speech that a constitution of an agreed character has a greater chance of success than a constitution which is imposed upon a country. Those of us who may agree to this constitution realize the difficulties in our own country. We feel that it is not merely our duty but it is also your duty to mobilize public opinion in favour of that constitution in my country. And I do suggest, Sir, that unless we are able to convince the political classes which have been taking deep interest in these matters—classes who have been a source of trouble to you and of trouble to some of us—unless we are able to convince them, the chances of the constitution making a wide appeal to the country are very limited in character. May I say in all sincerity that there are some matters on which I very radically differ and have differed from the Congress in my country. But with all my difference from the congress men, I hold that so far as Mr. Gandhi

is concerned, he sums up in his personality the highest degree of self-respect of India and the highest degree of patriotism in the country.

"I do say this to you that the present state of things in my country cannot be allowed to continue much longer without causing serious prejudice to the work which we have been doing in the midst of so much unpopularity. I am not one of those men who would like to keep the congress men out of the constitution, and I make a confession to you that I should consider it my duty to persuade every single congress man whom I could influence to come inside the constitution and to work it. I do not wish them to be treated as outlaws. If we are to discuss these things with whom are we to discuss them—with men who are behind prison bars or with men who are free? I know that so far as Mr. Gandhi is concerned, he will simply refuse to discuss any political question with me or with Mr. Jayakar or with anyone else inside jail. He is far too honorable to break any rule of jail. I know that I had immense difficulties in persuading him to discuss these things with me when I saw him two years ago, and that was when I went with the permission of Lord Irwin, not as his emissary as I was represented at that time by my critics to have gone, but because Mr. Jayakar and I felt that it was necessary for us to intervene at that time. On your own showing—I do not wish to discuss your policy—the situation in India has improved. That is the statement which I read this morning, and similar statements have been made on previous occasions within the last few weeks. If the situation has improved to this extent do you think that you are improving the chances of constitutional methods and of this constitution being accepted in my country by keeping 15,000 or 16,000—I do not know the exact number—of men in jail, men who may be thoroughly wrong—and I believe they were wrong—in the methods they adopted, but who nevertheless have gone to jail because of their opinions and because of certain activities? Can you keep Mr. Gandhi any longer in jail? Give us a chance to discuss with our countrymen these high problems which we have been discussing with you. Why should you be nervous of the future? You have recently taken ample powers which should enable you to cope with any grave situation which may arise. I am making an earnest appeal to you to consider the situation and I tell you that I have never known in my thirty years' experience as a public man so much bitterness, so much hostile feeling in Indian homes as I have witnessed during the last few months. I should like to correct that impression which prevails here. If we are to discuss these things, if we are to mobilize the opinion of our own countrymen, if you want to carry the largest possible amount of opinion in our country give us a free chance. Whether the Congress will agree to our proposals or whether they will reject them I cannot say. If they agree, nothing better can happen. If they refuse to agree, that will be their responsibility. We shall have done our duty and you will have done your duty, and I therefore ask you, Sir, at this time—I do not want to take advantage of the soft feelings in every English heart during Christmas; I am putting it on a practical business basis—whether you can afford to go on with this Constitution without taking the largest possible measure of opinion with you in the country. Sir, I contend—and I am borne out in this by my reading of English history—the situation in India, grave as it may have been according to opinion here, has not been unknown in English history in other countries. You have had to deal with situations similar to this in Ireland and other parts of the world, and there has always come a time when your policy has been revised. You have had to revise your policy in other parts of your Empire, and I ask you to revise your policy now, so that you may inspire a spirit of hopefulness in our country, so that people may feel that now the prospect before them is brighter and all the distrust and all the misapprehensions in the country may disappear, as your fog and mist sometimes disappear here. I have nothing more to say."

Fragment

This spear of grass,
This sun-sprinkled woodland,
This thrush on a limb of oak,
This bend in the stream,
This crooning of cedars,
This swirling butterfly
This mountain solitude,
This glistening teardrop of pity,
This clasp of the hand of a friend,
Tris ocean bottom love,—
I will not take for granted.

—*The Open Road.*

Ammunition for Peace-Lovers

"Will in No Circumstances Fight for King and Country"

By Sydney Strong

A single page leaflet, reprinted from UNITY of April 10, 1933.

100 for 35 cents
25 for 10 cents

Address L. G. Wentworth,
41 Kilsyth Road, Brookline, Mass.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
4 Months
— 21 — ISSUES 50c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 50 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

New and Revised Edition

INDIA IN BONDAGE

by JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Brought Strictly Up-to-Date—8 New Chapters on

The Momentous Events of the Last Two Years in England and India—India's Future—Will Gandhi Win?—Will There be a Bloody Revolution?—Is the New Constitution which Britain is Forging for India, a CHARTER OF FREEDOM, or a STEEL FRAME OR STRONGER BONDAGE?

$2.00 at All Bookstores or Direct from

LEWIS COPELAND COMPANY, 570 Lexington Ave., New York

An Unusual Issue!

The New Humanist

for May-June

contains the full text and signatures of

A HUMANIST MANIFESTO

with an explanation by Raymond B. Bragg and *critical comment by* John Haynes Holmes, M. C. Otto, Arthur E. Morgan and Harold Buschman.

also articles and reviews:

HUMANIST RELIGION
Roy Wood Sellars

A MYSTICAL MOOD
Rupert Holloway

HUMANISM AND SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE
Oliver L. Reiser

RECENT SOCIAL TRENDS
Roland R. Renne

NATURALISM AND PHYSICAL REALISM
Edgar S. Brightman
J. A. C. F. Auer

BEAUTY IN A MACHINE AGE
F. S. Stowell

HUMANISM FOR LAYMEN
Curtis W. Reese

Yearly $1.00 *Single Copies 20c*

THE NEW HUMANIST
105 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois